

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-33 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-2 and 4-33 stand rejected. Claim 3 has been previously cancelled. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 19, 27 and 32 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application, drawings and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 4-6 and 8 stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended Claims 4-6 and 8 to overcome these informalities. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2 and 11-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinschnitz (U.S. Pat. No. 5,253,184; hereinafter "Kleinschnitz") in view of "Triple-Triple Redundant 777 Primary Flight Computer" by Y. C. (Bob) Yeh, 1996, hereinafter "Yeh." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that Kleinschnitz appears to disclose a machine initiated maintenance system for use with printer systems 40-42. In Kleinschnitz, it appears that a machine, such as a printer 40, can send an error log and operating parameters over communication links 50-53 to a regional maintenance system 30 and in turn to a central maintenance system 1. Each level of maintenance system includes a database of

possible solutions for the error in the customer replaceable item, such as printer 40. Kleinschnitz also appears to disclose the use of functional detection circuits 20 to detect errors in the printer 40. In particular, “the functional detection circuits 20 identify failures that occur within customer equipment 40” (see at least Col. 5, lines 24-25). The functional detection circuits 20 “transmit a failure report...whenever the functional detection circuits 20 determine that one or more of the hardware or software components contained within the customer equipment has failed” (see at least Col. 4, lines 19-22). Based on the errors logged by the functional detection circuits, the internal expert system 11 may notify personnel to repair the customer equipment 40. Yeh appears to disclose a system for monitoring components of a fly by wire system. In contrast, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

...storing the knowledge base in a computer-based medium, the computer-based medium being **accessible to a plurality of users over a user interface;**
receiving an incoming message **from at least one specific user of the plurality of users from the user interface**, where the incoming message characterizes a mobile platform technical issue relating to the mobile platform...(emphasis added).

In view of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully assert that Kleinschnitz and Yeh, either alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or disclose each and every feature of Claim 1. In particular, Kleinschnitz does not teach, suggest or disclose a computer-based medium being accessible to a plurality of users over a user interface or receiving an incoming message from at least one specific user of the plurality of users from the user interface where the incoming message characterizes a mobile platform technical issue relating to the mobile platform. Rather, Kleinschnitz teaches that **functional detection circuits 20 detect all failures** or technical issues that occur

with the customer equipment, and that the **functional detection circuits 20 transmit all failures** to the internal expert system 11. Kleinschnitz does not teach, suggest or disclose receiving a mobile platform technical issue from at least one specific user of the plurality of users from the user interface as claimed. Yeh does not remedy these shortcomings of Kleinschnitz as Yeh does not teach, suggest or disclose receiving a technical issue from a user interface as claimed. Furthermore, Applicants note that modifying Kleinschnitz to include receiving a mobile platform technical issue from at least one specific user of the plurality of users from the user interface would impermissibly modify the method of operation of the failure evaluation system of Kleinschnitz, and thus, is improper.

Accordingly, as Kleinschnitz and Yeh, singly or in combination, do not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

With regard to Claims 2 and 11-17, Claims 2 and 11-17 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1, and thus, should be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth for Claim 1 above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 2 and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 4-10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinschnitz in view of Yeh. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to Claims 4-10 and 18, Applicants note these claims depend directly or indirectly from either Claim 1, and thus, should be in condition for allowance for at

least the reasons set forth for Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejections of Claims 4-10 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 19-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinschnitz in view of Yeh, further in view of "Role-Based Access Control Models" by Ravi S. Sandhu et al., 1996 hereinafter "Sandhu." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully refer the Office to the remarks regarding Claims 1, 2 and 11-17 for a discussion of the Kleinschnitz and Yeh references. With regard to Sandhu, Applicants note that Sandhu appears to disclose a role-based access control system for granting or restricting the access of various users to computer based resources. In contrast to the cited references, independent Claim 19 has been amended to recite:

...storing the knowledge base in a computer-based medium, **the computer-based medium being accessible to a plurality of users by a user interface;**
receiving a mobile platform technical issue from **at least one of the plurality of users from the user interface...**(emphasis added).

Independent Claim 27 has been amended to recite:

...receiving an incoming message over a computer network from a customer, where the incoming message characterizes a mobile platform technical issue associated with the mobile platform **that is generated by the customer interacting with a user interface;**

* * *

displaying the outgoing message on the user interface
(emphasis added).

Independent Claim 32 has been amended to recite:

...a user interface that enables the plurality of users to access the knowledge base ... (emphasis added).

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that Kleinschnitz, Yeh and Sandhu, either alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or disclose each and every feature of Claims 19, 27 and 32. As discussed, neither Kleinschnitz nor Yeh teach, suggest or disclose receiving a mobile platform technical issue from at least one specific user of the plurality of users from the user interface. Further, neither Kleinschnitz nor Yeh teach, suggest or disclose displaying an outgoing message (relating to the solution of the technical issue) on the user interface. Sandhu does not remedy these shortcomings of Kleinschnitz and Yeh. Rather, Sandhu discloses merely that it is desirable to restrict access to various computer resources.

Accordingly, as Kleinschnitz, Yeh and Sandhu, singly or in combination, do not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of Claims 19, 27 and 32, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 19, 27 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).


With regard to Claims 20-26, 28-31 and 33, Claims 20-26, 28-31 and 33 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 19, 27 or 32, and thus, should be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth for Claims 19, 27 and 32 above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 20-26, 28-31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/8/07

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/chs